

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1-14 stand rejected.

Claims 1, 13 and 14 have been amended herein to clarify applicant's claimed invention. The amendments are based on the original disclosure no new matter is entered.

The claims are clarified in that the extensible mark-up language grammar document is encoded utilizing the complete extensible mark-up language grammar.

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ferrel in view of Herigstad et al. (hereinafter Herigstad).

In the Office Action it is admitted that Ferrel does not describe the subset of the mark-up language. The Office Action argues it would have been obvious for such a feature and supports this argument with Herigstad.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons:

The Office Action on page 4 describes that "use of a markup language that is a subset of the HTML or XML languages" is well known.

As described in Herigstad documents may be coded in either the XML or WML. WML being a subset. It is important that Herigstad teaches the document is encoded with the WML language (page 4, paragraph 39).

This is in contrast to applicant's claimed "an extensible mark-up language document, said extensible mark-up language document compatible with the complete extensible mark-up language grammar, using subset of a complete extensible mark-up language."

Herigstad also describes the filter 130 in paragraph 39, however this is different because the document is filtered with the filter and then the filtered document parsed using the WML.

This is different from applicant's claimed parsing an extensible mark-up language document, said extensible mark-up language document compatible with the complete extensible mark-up language grammar, using a subset of a complete extensible mark-up language grammar, the subset being designated for the processing device and including less than said complete extensible mark-up language grammar.

Herigstad is parsing the filtered document where applicant claims parsing said extensible mark-up language document compatible with the complete extensible mark-up language grammar. Thus, the combination of references fails to teach each and every claimed feature in the independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons the rejection of the independent claims should be withdrawn.


Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 13 and 14 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-12 should also be allowed at least based on dependence from independent claim 1 as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the dependent claims.

Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position as well as the right to introduce relevant secondary considerations including long-felt but unresolved needs in the industry, failed attempts by others to invent the invention, and the like, should that become necessary.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Larry Liberchuk  
Registration No. 40,352

Date: December 13, 2005

  
By: Steve Cha  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,069

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (901) 333-9602  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to MAIL STOP RCE, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA. 22313 on 12/13/05.

Steve Cha, Reg. No. 44,069  
(Name of Registered Rep.)

  
(Signature and Date)